FCC 395

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

Approved by OMB 3060-0076 Est. time per response: 1 hour

COMMON CARRIER ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT REPORT

[Please read instructions before completing and for Notice regarding public burden.]

SECTION 1 - General Information															
1. Name and Malling Address of Respondent RCM Telecom Services of Illinois, LLC	espondent s of Illin	ois, LLC											Ched is a ct	Check here if this is a change of	
2640 W. Bradley Flace Chicago, IL 60618	1)												address.	SS.	
2. Year Report Filed 2019		3. Reporting Per Period Covers 3/22/19	Reporting Period (Ending D Period Covered by Report) 3/22/19	ng Date of Pay ort)	۸		4. Number of Reporting a. Few b. 7 16 c	Number of Full-Time Employees during Selected Reporting Period (check one): a. Fewer than 16 (complete Sections I, IV, and V only) b. 7 16 or more (complete all sections)	ployees durir one): omplete Secti	ng Selected ions I, IV, and ons)	V only)				O Marine Britain
SECTION II - Full-Time Employees.	is.														
)	Numt Report emplo	Number of Employees (Report employees in only one category)	/ees ine category)						
•							ίτ	Race/Ethnicity							
Job Cafegories	影	Hispanic or						Not-Hispanic or Latino	c or Latino						Total
•	-	Latino			Male	9					Female	ile			Columns A - N
	Male	Female	White	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Two or more races	White	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Two or more races	
	∢	æ	O	۵	ш	L.	O	I	1	ſ	포	٦	M	z	0
Executive/Senior Level Officials and Managers												·			
First/Mid-Level Officials and 1.2	8	2	15	∞		2		1	3	9		1			41
als	2 2		2	-		1				2					10
Technicians	3 5		5	4	1			2							17
Sales Workers	8	8	20	9		2		1							35
Administrative Support Workers	2	2	1	1					1	11					16
rkers	6 5		4	12					-				-		22
Operatives	7														0
Laborers and Helpers	8														0
Service Workers	6														0
TOTAL	10 18	7	48	32	2	S	0	4	4	19	0	2	1	0	142
PREVIOUS YEAR TOTAL 11	1 23	5	45	26	7	7	0	4	4	23	0	7	1	0	137
														Revised Dec	FCC 395 Revised December 2007

Pemale Asian American Two or more American American Two or more Indian or American American American Other Pacific Islander Asian American Two or more Islander American								Num (Report empk	Number of Employees (Report employees in only one category)	yees one category)						
Higherine or Higherine or Higherine or Higherine or Latifor Higherine or Latifor Higherine or Latifor Higherine or Latifor Higherine or Higherine									Race/Ethnicity							
Latino Female White Black of Main Advanced Place	Job Categories	Hispi	anic or						Not-Hispani	c or Latino				1		Total
		ڐ	atino			Ma	elle					Ferr	ıale			Columns A - N
Page		Male	Female	White	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Two or more races	White	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Two or more races	
Authority Auth	•	⋖	В	O	۵	ш	Ľ.	၅	т		ŋ	포	7	M	Z	0
The control of the																0
A					·											0
State Stat												·				0
A																0
Septence Septence																0
Separate Separate	ative Support															0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	kers															0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0																0
ns of Federal, state, territorial, or local statutes have been filed against this sy this report. qual employment opportunity statute have been filed against this company. and, file number or other designation, and current status or disposition. Telephone No. (609) 681–2189 ON THIS FORMA ARE PUNISHABLE BY FINE AND/OR IMPRISONIMENT (18 U.S.C. 1001). UCTION PERMIT (47 U.S.C. 312 (A)(1) AND/OR FORFEITURE (47 U.S.C. 503).			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
is of Federal, state, territorial, or local statutes have been filed against this by this report. qual employment opportunity statute have been filed against this company. and, file number or other designation, and current status or disposition. and, file number or other designation, and current status or disposition. [Telephone No.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ovisions of Federal, state, territorial, or local statutes have been filed against this ered by this report. any equal employment opportunity statute have been filed against this company. en heard, file number or other designation, and current status or disposition. any equal employment opportunity statute have been filed against this company. [609) 681-2189 MADE ON THIS FORM ARE PUNISHABLE BY FINE AND/OR IMPRISONMENT (18 U.S.C. 1001) NSTRUCTION PERMIT (47 U.S.C. 312 (A)(1) AND/OR FORFEITURE (47 U.S.C. 503).	SECTION IV - Report of Discrimi	nation Com	olaints Pursu	ant to 47 CFR	22.321, 23.5	5, 90.168, 10	1.4, and 101.	311.								
MANCE (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189	This is to advise the Company before any In This is to advise the Company and Interest the Company and Interest Indication	Commission to cody having cody having cody commission to parties invoc	hat no compla competent juri: hat the followi ived, date file:	ints regarding sdiction in suc og complaints 1, courts or ag	violations of in matters dur alleging viola	the equal emping the calencutions of the primitions of the manufacturers.	loyment proviar year cover	isions of Federed by this reproperty equal emply n'heard, file n	eral, state, terroort.	itorial, or loca tunity statute r designation	al statutes har have been fil , and current	ve been filed a led against this status or dispo	against this s company. osition.			
WILLY (609) 681-2189 (609) 681-2189 NATE FORM ARE PUNISHABLE BY FINE AND/OR IMPRISONMENT (18 U.S.C. 1001) NSTRUCTION PERMIT (47 U.S.C. 312 (A)(1) AND/OR FORFEITURE (47 U.S.C. 503).	SECTION V - Certification	nedne inform	nation, and bel	ief. all stateme	ents in this reg	port are true a	nd correct.									
WILLFULLY FALSE STATEMENTS MADE ON THIS FORM ARE PUNISHABLE BY FINE AND/OR IMPRISONMENT (18 U.S.C. 1001) OF ANY STATION LICENSE OR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT (47 U.S.C. 312 (A)(1) AND/OR FORFEITURE (47 U.S.C. 503).	Date Type 174	ed or Printec	Name of Per Conrad	son Signing			Signature	* o ww	1 X	FINA			Telephone () (609)	vo. 581-218	6	
	Title of Person Signing Vice President, Hum	an Resc	urces		WILLFULLY OF ANY ST	FALSE STATATION LICEN	TEMENTS MA	ADE ON THIS STRUCTION	FORM ARE PERMIT (47 L	PUNISHABLI	E BY FINE AI)(1) AND/OR	ND/OR IMPRI	SONMENT (1 E (47 U.S.C.	I8 U.S.C. 100 503).	1) AND/OR R	EVOCATION
															Revised De	FCC 395 cember 2007



RE: FCC Form 395 Section IV 2019 Filing Year

Charge:

Wage Claim - IL. Department of Labor (DOL)

EEOC Charge - Americans Disability Act - Disability / Retaliation

Charge #:

IL DOL - 17-002447

EEOC - 440-2018-01634

Employee:

Filing Date:

September 9, 2017 - DOL

December 11, 2017 - EEOC

Background:

Wage Claim:

Employee was hired on as a technician on July 25, 2011. Employee is no longer employed by the company. At the time of these claims they were and out on a LOA. Individual claimed that they are owed wages as a result of wages not being paid from September 2011 through June 2017. Employee states they are owed wages for 207.5 hours of unpaid lunch breaks in which the employee actually never took and worked. RCN received the formal complaint from the IL DOL on April 10, 2018.

Disability Claim:

Employee also then filed a Disability and Relation charge with the EEOC on December 11, 2017. In the charge individual stated that he had requested reasonable accommodations for a disability and were not provided resulting in their discrimination. At the time the company was unaware of any specific accommodation request as a result of a disability.

Status:

May 2018 - The Company submitted a written response via outside counsel to the IL Department of Labor (DOL) on April 30, 2018. At this time the claim resides with the IL. DOL and the company is awaiting their response of our answer and information sent. May 2019 - While the EEOC charge and DOL charge were running concurrently the company was represented by outside counsel who responded back to the IL. DOL and also drafted companies response to the EEOC ADA charge. As part of the EEOC process a mediation session was set up to see if the issue could be resolved. As a result of mediation the company agreed a not fault small settlement amount and both claims were closed and resolved.



RE: FCC Form 395 Section IV 2019 Filing Year

Charge:

Race / Retaliation Charge - EEOC

Lawsuit - US District Court For Northern Division of Illinois Eastern Division

Charge #:

EEOC - 440-2017-06377

18 - CV-07038

Employee:

Filing Date:

September 28, 2017

October 19, 2018

Background:

Employee was hired on October 31, 2011 as a technician and was promoted to Installation Supervisor in March 2014. Employee was performing in 2015 at satisfactory level, however began to experience performance issues in 2016 resulting in needs development rating on the annual evaluation. This resulted in numerous one on one meeting with management and an improvement plan being created for the employee. The employee's supervisory performance issues continued into 2017 resulting in a final written warning being issued to them on May 17, 2017. The employee's performance issues continued following the written warning which resulted in the decision by management to separate employee's employment with the Company on August 14, 2017. Following separation employee filed charges with the EEOC in September 2017 stating their belief that the separation of employment was a result of the company discriminating against him due to being denied a promotion due to his race and retaliation as a result of complaining about racial discrimination.

Status:

The company and employee participated in the EEOC's formal mediation program and employee and company were unable to reach an agreement. The company submitted through outside counsel our formal written position statement to the EEOC on April 6, 2018. At this time the matter resides with the EEOC investigator assigned to the charge. No further action required at this time. May 2019 Update - Ex -employee obtained outside counsel and in August of 2018 the ex-employee and their attorney requested that the EEOC close their investigation and issue a Notice of Right to Sue which they did and

was mailed to the company on August 21, 2018. The ex-employee and their attorney filled a lawsuit against the company on October 19, 2018. The lawsuit process started and the judge assigned to the case requested as part of their legal process conducts an upfront settlement conference. Through this settlement conference process the ex-employee and the company came to a reasonable settlement to resolve our differences and issues have been resolved.



RE: FCC Form 395 Section IV 2019 Filing Year

Court Action: Lawsuit - United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division

Case #: 18-CV -04575

Employee:

Filing Date:

July 2, 2018

Background:

This individual had filed charges against the Company with the EEOC back in December 2017. One for Retaliation, Disability and also filed a prior charge of retaliation prior in January of 2017. Both charges were described in our 2018 report. In both cases the EEOC closed the charges with no finding of discrimination / retaliation and issued right to sue notifications to the employee. The last notification with right to sue was issued in April 2018. The ex-employee whose employment was separated in August 2017 filed suit against RCN with the US District Court of the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division on July 2, 2018 alleging that the company discriminated against her based on a disability and retaliated against her for engaging in protected activity.

Status:

The company responded to the legal action and hired outside counsel and the trial process began. The company and counsel responded with an answer to the complaint and the discovery process started. The judge assigned to the case scheduled a settlement conference as part of their normal practice to encourage both parties to settle matter out of court. At this settlement conference the ex-employee and the company with the assistance of the magistrate came to a reasonable closure and no fault settlement to the claims of discrimination. This case is now closed.



RE: FCC Form 395 Section IV 2019 Filing Year

EEOC Charge:

Claim of Discrimination - Race, Color, Age, Sex, Retaliation

Charge #:

440-2018-01919

Filing Date:

July, 5 2018

Court Action:

Lawsuit filed in US District Court for the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Div.

Case #:

18-CV-6959

Filing Date:

October 16, 2018

Employee:

Background:

This individual was employed by the company as a building relation representative hired in September 2015. During late 2017 an allegation was made against this individual for inappropriate actions against a fellow employee after a weekend non-work related event sometime during mid to late summer 2017. This issue was never brought to the company's attention until December 2017 at which time once notified by the other employee making the allegations against this employee the company immediately began an investigation. This individual was extremely upset by the allegations. During this investigation the employee accused of the inappropriate behavior made allegations that they were being treated differently within the department due to the darkness of their color were fellow employees within their department were being treated better due to their light complexion and given opportunities not being provided to them. The company investigated both allegations. The company upon completing the investigation was unable to determine any inappropriate behavior occurred and found there was no facts supporting the complaint of poor treatment due to the darkness of their skin, and company representatives counseled both parties to maintain appropriate professional behavior in the workplace as these allegations created morale issues with department that both employees worked in. These morale issues continued with allegations of unfair treatment and difficulty with the team being able to work together. Ultimately the employee who made the allegation resigned and left the company however the employee in question who was originally accused of the inappropriate behavior continued to struggle that the allegations were made and how the company handled the action. During this time the position the employee held was changing and evolving which also created difficulty for the individual. Ultimately employee requested and was approved for a medical leave of absence in July 2018 shortly after she filed charges of discrimination with the EEOC in earlier that month. Employee obtained outside counsel and

after filing the EEOC charges on July 5th, 2018 the employee and their attorney requested a dismissal of charges and a notice of rights to sue letter / finding from the EEOC which was completed and mail on July 16th, 2018 prior to any investigation of the allegations for discrimination were reviewed by the EEOC. In October 2018 the employee and their employee and their attorney filed a lawsuit against the company in the US District Court for the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division for similar claims as related to their EEOC charge. While employee was out on approved leave their whole department was restructured and ultimately the role that they originally were employed for was eliminated. As a result once the leave ended the employees employment ended as they were unable to obtain another position within the company. Following the end of the leave claim the individual appealed the decision by our disability carrier which actually overturned the decision to end the leave and individual was provided with additional pay from the disability benefits and is currently being reviewed for Long term disability benefits.

Status:

The company responded to the legal action when the suit was filed and had outside counsel assist and the trial process began. The company and counsel responded with an answer to the complaint and the discovery process was to get started. The judge assigned to the case scheduled a settlement conference as part of their normal practice to encourage both parties to settle matter out of court if possible. At this settlement conference the ex-employee and the company with the assistance of the magistrate came to a reasonable closure and no fault settlement to the claims of the allegations made. This case is now closed.